

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

July 22, 1999

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Dave Williams called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman Dave Williams; Board Members Hal Beighley, Renee Cannon, Alissa Crane, Walter Lemon, Stewart Straus.

Staff was represented by Senior Planner Bill Roth and Recording Secretary Cheryl Gonzales.

VISITORS

Mr. Lemon addressed the board requesting a drive-by of the new high school under construction on 125th, Southridge High School, by staff and by members of the Board if they have the time between now and the next meeting. They need to review the mechanical equipment screens installed on the roof to determine if the screens meet the intent of the condition of approval. It will be brought up again at the next meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

Continuances

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Williams read the format for the meeting. There were no disqualifications and no one in the audience challenged the right of any member of the Board to participate in the hearings. Chairman Williams asked if anyone wanted to request a continuance to a later date for any agenda item.

A. BDR 98097/VAR 98009 - PRECISION AUTO BUILDING ADDITION

(Request for continuance to August 12, 1999)

Request for Design Review approval to construct an approximately 8,732 square foot secondary building at the existing Precision Auto site. The building proposes ten automobile bays in which additional off-street parking is being proposed to allow for the increased parking requirements. A Design Variance is also being requested to reduce the required rear setback from 20 feet to 9 feet. The site is within the General Commercial (GC) zone. The site is located south of SW

Carousel Court, west of SW 141st Avenue, north of SW Tualatin Valley Highway, east of SW 144th Avenue, and is approximately 1.08 acres in size. Map 1S1-9CC, Tax Lot 3200.

B. **BDR99035 - GRAMOR MURRAY SCHOLLS**

(Request for continuance to August 12, 1999)

Request for Design Review approval for approximately 165,250 square feet of the commercial use center. The Design Review request includes review of nine new buildings and one existing building to be remodeled. The Planning Commission will hear the applicants request for Conditional Use Permit approval for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) on 21.2 acres of the former PGE site on the northwest corner of SW Murray Boulevard and SW Scholls Ferry Road. The PUD request is to be in multiple phases to include proposed retail, office uses, restaurants, and approximately 20 townhomes on the northeast corner of the site. Proposed access points include one on SW Murray Boulevard and three on SW Scholls Ferry Road. The development proposal is on Tax Lots 100 and 800 of Assessor's Map 1S1-32DA and is zoned Town Center – Sub Regional. The site is within the R5, TC-SR, LI zone. Map 1S1-32DA; Tax Lots 100, 500, 700 & 800, and Map 1S1-32AD; Tax Lots 800 & 900.

Mr. Beighley MOVED and Mr. Straus SECONDED a motion to continue BDR 98097/VAR 98009 Precision Auto Building Addition and BDR99035 Gramor Murray Scholls to August 12, 1999.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. **BDR99033 - CORNELL BUSINESS PARK PHASE 3**

Request for approval to construct a building for office and warehouse use at a site located on NW Bethany Court. The proposed building will be approximately 17,280 square feet in size, with associated parking and landscaping. The applicant also requests a modification of the off-street loading requirements for the proposed building. The site is within the Industrial Park (IP) zone. The site is located west of Cornell Road, south of Twin Oaks Road, and east of 157th, and is approximately .63 acres in size. Map 1N1-31AD; Tax Lot 1000 & 1001.

Bill Roth, Senior Planner, Development Services Division, indicated that the request is for an approval to construct a building for warehouse, office and retail use at a site on NW Bethany Court. The proposed building will be approximately 17,280 square feet in size with associated parking and landscaping. The applicant also has requested a modification to the off street loading requirements for the proposed building which was approved by the Facilities Review Committee and report can be found within the Facilities Review exhibit number nine within the report. There are really no issues identified by staff. During the initial process it was identified that there were four parking spaces that were perpendicular in toward the water quality facility

that necessitated some retaining walls and potentially some guard railing on the sidewalk on the north property. The applicant under a recommendation from staff, has removed that, reduced the retaining walls and eliminated the need for the potential guard rail along the sidewalk on the north. With that change, the staff is recommending approval based on the findings, facts and criteria contained within the staff report.

Mr. Lemon indicated that it says Phase 3 and he did not remember if it is adjacent to an additional industrial building constructed in the same type of buildings?

Mr. Roth said that the name of the project is what the applicant submitted and staff used it as the project title. The owner of the property is the same developer of the development towards the east, which are two large flex tenant warehouse campus industrial spaces, and were approved about 2 ½ years ago. In addition, the same applicant developed the Bethany Office Building which is also to the east along the cul-de-sac towards Cornell Road and is between Indoor Goals and the Hemstreet Office Building.

MR. GENE MILDREN, President, Mildren Design Group, 11830 SW Kerr Parkway, Suite 325, Lake Oswego, OR 97035, and the architect on the project. The facility is basically a concrete tilt-up building, 17,280 square feet. It is basically geared for smaller tenants. The tenant spaces will range in size from 3300 square feet to 4300 square feet. What is unusual about this site is that where Bethany Court end in a cul-de-sac is under power lines. There are a series of four power lines, different easements with BPA and other types of easements which run through this property. It runs all the way through down to the creek and also up to Highway 26. This power line easement extends into about half of the site, making that half basically an unbuildable area. The building glass has been kept all the way across the front and we have developed all the entrances off the front of the building. We are anticipating that approximately 25% of the building area will be office space and 75% warehousing or storage space associated with the office. The loading spaces been put to the back of the building so as to not be viewed from the public street. On the other side of the parking area is the water quality area. Per staffs recommendation we eliminated some parking and all the retaining walls. There are no retaining walls at all associated with the water quality area up front so there is quite a buffer in this area. All total there is approximately 28% landscaping for the project which exceeds the requirement of 15% by a considerable amount. There are 56 parking spaces which is approximately what is needed in order to make this a viable leasing option for the tenants who will be using the building.

Mr. Lemon asked if the base color of the building is buff and the green is the accent right in front of the store front openings.

Mr. Mildren answered that the building color is a wheat type and it has accent areas underneath each of the store front areas that are a darker green type color. The glass is a reflective type green with anodized aluminum frames.

Mr. Lemon questioned if the reveals make a band all the way around the building, is there is no accent color other than that? Mr. Mildren said they were trying to get away from color striping like a four foot color stripe that runs all the way around the building. Most buildings now are getting away from striping the whole world. The reveals and the concrete indicate more of a shadow and there is more of a texture involved with the concrete tilt. The reveals themselves create more of a horizontal line going around the building as opposed to having to put a color up that goes all the way around the building.

Mr. Lemon said he would let the architects on the Board make comments if they wanted to. He indicated with regard to rooftop screening that they are sitting quite far back but that is still going to be one of the conditions. Whoever comes in for a permit to finish out their space on the inside when it comes time for leasing will be required to do whatever is necessary for screening.

Mr. Straus said the parapet is a little bit curious. He asked if Mr. Mildren could explain the reason for the varying heights on the north elevation and what happens when it comes to the corners. Mr. Mildren indicated they were trying to make the building more interesting by not having the same level building going all the way around the entire site. The building steps from a drainage standpoint going from the east to the west, the building is drained from the west side by a gutter up above the drive-in doors and the personnel doors on the back side. Instead of making the top plate the same all the way around the building they have chosen to step the sides down coming around the building on the sides.

Mr. Straus said he could see it on the north side but looking at the east elevation the parapet at the north end of that elevation sticks up higher. Mr. Mildren said that was a code requirement because of the proximity to the property line.

Mr. Straus asked if from the south elevation you can see the north parapet beyond. Mr. Mildren answered yes.

Mr. Straus stated he understood the reason for stepping it down but was wondering if they are responding only to the functional reason and the change at the northeast corner is an abrupt one rather than continuing the same stepped character around the building in same manner it just ended at that corner. If the intent was to use this as a way of creating some interest at the top of the building why was it not continued around the corner in some way to make a little more gradual transition rather than stopping abruptly at the northeast corner. Mr. Mildren said they were trying to drop the building down so they would end up with only a five foot high parapet in the northwest corner. Across the east elevation it ends up straight across because of the way the roof ties in at that point. The only place it could be stepped would be across the south elevation very similar to the north elevation.

Mr. Straus said he was not saying they needed to make a change, he was just trying to understand why it ended up the way it is. It seems awkward leaving that parapet sticking up and not doing anything other than meeting the code requirement. Mr. Mildren said they could take a look at it but he is not sure how it would look with the east elevation being all the same

height going around the corner and stepping down to the south elevation and then staying the same across the west elevation.

Mr. Straus said he was not trying to redesign the building. He was just raising the question of how they got to where they are and if it really achieved the purpose of the steps to give visual interest. Mr. Mildren said it was a combination of the two. It creates visual interest and takes away from, as the roof is sloping across the north side, a high parapet that does not do anything and adds a structural problem to the building at the same time.

Chairman Williams asked if at the east elevation there was the top of the roof or if there was some parapet. Mr. Mildren said they cannot make it the top of the roof anymore because of the new seismic codes so the elevation is about eight inches down at the highest point and it starts from the edge and goes on to the west with a straight pitch.

Mr. Lemon asked for clarification on the color schedule, the key notes, if the gutter is P1, downspout is P1, the exterior soft board P2 is green, then P1 must be the buff throughout. Mr. Mildren answered yes.

Mr. Lemon MOVED and Mr. Beighley SECONDED a motion to approve BDR99-00033 Cornell Business Park Phase 3 based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background, facts, findings and conclusions found in the staff report dated July 22, 1999, including conditions numbers 1 through 20.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Beighley MOVED and Mr. Straus SECONDED a motion to approve the minutes for May 13 and June 10, 1999, as presented.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:00 p.m.